

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/642,376 | Applicant(s) KUCHINSKY ET AL. |
| | Examiner Navneet K. Ahluwalia | Art Unit 2166 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Navneet K. Ahluwalia.

(3) Hosain Alam (SPE 2166).

(2) Mike Beck (Req. No. 40,907).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 January 2007

Time: 4:30pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

possible 35 USC 101 rejection and 112 2nd paragraph rejection for language used in claim 68.

Claims discussed:

68

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 68 recited "A computer readable medium carrying one or more instructions" this could be suggestive of being a signal or carrier wave, to overcome this possible rejection, it was suggested to replace "carrying" by "embodying". Furthermore, claim 68 recited in line 4 "execution of one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors causes the one or more processors to perform" this could be considered as an attempt to perform but not definitely conclude in performing, which could lead it to being vague and indefinite. To overcome this possible rejection, it was suggested to replace "causes the one or more processors to perform" by "results in performing". These suggestions were agreed upon by Mr. Beck .